

## SANDY SMELTERS

## SUMMARY OF FOCUS GROUP RESEARCH

- Four focus group sessions have been conducted on residents of Historic Sandy.
- Three sessions were conducted on August 14, 1995; the fourth was conducted on February 5, 1997.

## INITIAL FOCUS GROUPS

- The purpose of the early sessions was to obtain descriptive data from residents on their experiences dealing with the EPA, UDEQ and Asarco, regarding soil removal activities conducted in 1994. A total of 31 residents participated in the initial focus groups.
  - Group 1 was comprised of citizens affected by soil remediation. Group 2 was elderly residents not affected by soil remediation, and Group 3 was comprised of the mothers of young children (< 7 years).

Taken as a whole, information from the initial focus group sessions suggests that lead in the soil, and its potential health impact, is not a significant concern among the majority of participants.

## RECENT FOCUS GROUP

- The fourth and most recent focus group session was conducted to determine present day awareness of lead in soil issues and to determine what, if any, future course of action they felt was required.
  - The group consisted of residents deemed as opinion leaders - those involved in church, civic, and education activities. Eight individuals participated, representing older residents and those having young children.

## SALIENT ISSUES

- No person mentioned environmental risks prior to prompting, indicating that lead in soil is not on the "A-List" of concerns. Growth related issues topped the list of concerns among this group of Historic Sandy residents.

Went to  
participate  
was to  
find  
people who  
represent  
the  
local  
comm.

☐ AR  
☒ SITE  
☐ POST DECISION PUBLIC DOCUMENT  
☐ PRIVILEGED/CLAIM  
☐ FOIA EXEMPT/CLAIM  
☐ WORK PERFORMED DOCUMENT  
 CONTRACT # \_\_\_\_\_  
 FILE PLAN # 3.0  
 KEYWORD #(S) \_\_\_\_\_

## SANDY SMELTERS

### SUMMARY OF FOCUS GROUP RESEARCH (continued)

#### SOIL REMEDIATION

- Only after prompting do respondents mention soil remediation/sampling awareness.
- Assume that the work is completed and are skeptical about the need for continued soil remediation. If it was a real problem, it should have been taken care of when EPA discovered the problem.
- Those with young children express some concern, but feel sufficient actions have been taken and that the efforts were precautionary rather than real.
- Respondents feel no significant health concerns about lead in their soil.
- Majority considers continued EPA efforts as wasteful.
- They tend to consider "hard evidence" as the true yardstick to measure need for remediation (e.g. history of health problems, blood - lead measurements).
- Lead in the soil is not a priority to this group.

#### SOURCE OF FEAR

COMMUNITY  
NEEDS INFORMATION

A few respondents were concerned about the safety of their soil, described as fear of the unseen.

- Some worry about future health risks, some said that any risk is unacceptable, others said concern stems from lack of communication and education about possible risks; characterized the process as "a mystery".
- Residents desire objective information, and "concrete results of soil and blood lead testing".

REDUCIBLE

SOURCE OF

INFORMATION

1) SALT LAKE COUNTY HEALTH

#### CPM versus SOIL REMOVAL

2) UOERQ

- All group members clearly favored the CPM over soil removal. Respondents want three things; namely, soil testing, regular blood testing of children, and ongoing communication and status reports - in other words, a community protection measures program. They do not favor soil removal as the first line of defense.

Some mention  
of private  
detectors as

Best source for monitoring